HUMAN EVENTS SUBSCRIPTION RATES GO UP JULY 1
Extend your subscription at present low rates.
See Page 3.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 19 May 12, 1960 Section 1 — News

GOLDWATER: *Tops in GOP poll* ..... (page 1)
KOREA: *The fine hand of UNESCO?* .... (page 1)
WEST VIRGINIA: *Dividing the Dems* .. (page 2)
KEFAUVER: *Tennessee turns away* ..... (page 4)
HOUSING: *No "emergency"* ..... (page 4)

Vice-Presidential Favorite: The virtually final figures of a poll of Republican county chairmen show that Senator Barry Goldwater runs first, with a comfortable lead, as choice for Vice-Presidential candidate on the GOP ticket. In March HUMAN EVENTS sent out questionnaires to 3405 Republican county chairmen, listing eight Republicans who have indicated interest in receiving the No. 2 position on this year's GOP ticket.

They are: Senator Goldwater of Arizona; Congressman Halleck of Indiana; Governor Hatfield of Oregon; Senator Keating of New York; United Nations Ambassador Lodge; Labor Secretary Mitchell; Senator Scott of Pennsylvania; Interior Secretary Seaton.

With returns dwindling to a trickle, a total of 1367 (or 40.1 per cent of the total sent out) reveals Goldwater ahead with 386 votes, Ambassador Lodge second with 360 and Congressman Halleck third with 174.

In the questionnaire, the county chairmen were asked by HUMAN EVENTS to name—in confidence—their choice for Vice President. The questionnaire excluded Governor Nelson Rockefeller, saying that he has stated that under no circumstances will he allow himself to be drafted for the Vice Presidency. It also quoted Vice President Nixon as saying that geographical considerations should not be a factor in choosing a Vice President.

The final results, classified regionally, show the following:

(Listed alphabetically)	Northeast	Midwest	West	South and Border	Total
Goldwater	33	99	76	178	386
Halleck	5	89	14	66	174
Hatfield	4	3	15	5	27
Keating	25	7	7	36	75
Lodge	123	63	44	130	360
Mitchell	22	22	2	23	69
Scott	18	6	0	12	36
Seaton	1	69	15	18	103

Write Ins: Rockefeller 74, Morton 16, Others 47.

The first sampling from the poll, totaling 904 returns, was published on April 14 and showed Goldwater leading by four votes. Since then, the Arizonan has increased his margin over Lodge to 26 votes. In this period, Goldwater's proportion of the total vote went up from 25.6 to 28.2 per cent, while Lodge went from 25 to 26.4 per cent.

Goldwater's support ranges widely throughout the country, with only seven of his votes from Arizona. Approximately 22 per cent of Lodge's support came from his home state of Massachusetts; about 25 per cent of Halleck's votes were from Indiana. Seaton got half his votes from his native state, Nebraska, and neighboring Kansas and the Dakotas.

"Goldwater for Vice President" seems to be spreading to other groups than party professionals. The District of Columbia Young Republican College Federation on April 30 announced that a poll of its members showed that 80 per cent of those polled favored Goldwater as first choice, with 15 per cent for Lodge and 3 per cent for Mitchell.

Global Fifth Column: On Capitol Hill, few doubt that the "student" and "youth" uprisings in Korea and Turkey are part of a worldwide subversion pattern and that this pattern was designed at least indirectly by Moscow. In the past week, some legislators draw the conclusion that the organization which inspired the student disorders was none other than the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO.

The personnel of that group—long a target of criticism from conservatives in the US—includes all sorts of international "liberals," "do-gooders" and left-wingers, including Russian Communists. It pursues a policy of—to say the least—"anti-anti-communism" which helps to explain why the Korean students destroyed the Anti-Communist Museum in Seoul at the peak of the riots.

Some reports from Korea say that Syngman Rhee toppled from power, not because he was "tough" and "stubborn" (as commonly alleged), but because he was not tough and stubborn enough. For some years, friends had warned Rhee of the danger of harboring UNESCO in his country, but he had brushed aside such advice, saying that this UN group was simply a team of harmless professors and social service workers.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS • In Four Sections

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With the above as a perspective, Capital observers have no difficulty in understanding why Turkey suffered similar disorders from similar elements. For Turkey also has a UNESCO delegation. Premier Menderes of that country, however, is younger and tougher than Rhee and has no inhibitions about using force to put down fifth column activities.

What next? Capital observers suggest that—unless the international directors of the "pattern" get cold feet—"student" or "youth" mobs may get to work in other Free World bastions on the long firing line around Soviet Russia—in Viet Nam, for instance, and perhaps Iran (both recipients of the dubious ministrations of UNESCO).

Meanwhile, the responsibility of Secretary of State Herter for such situations gets further emphasis. The New Bedford (Mass.) *Standard-Times*—which helped elect Herter to the Governorship of the Bay State in 1952—demands: "Christian Herter should resign immediately—OR BE REMOVED, lest in evasion, unreality and pacifism—HE BRING US TO WORLD WAR III." (Editorial, April 27.)

Capitol Camera: While Ike talked economy in Government last week, Secretary of State Herter went to the NATO meeting in Ankara accompanied by a staff of 116. John Foster Dulles usually took two with him on such occasions.

• Thomas E. Dewey, still a power in the GOP, takes a retainer from the Turkish government. However, the Turks have cut down his honorarium from $150,000 a year to $75,000—he hasn't produced much for them.

• **How Not to Win an Election—neither Nixon nor any other high member of the Administration presently plans to speak for the GOP Senatorial candidate (Governor John Davis) in the tough North Dakota election to be held June 28. The outcome may affect GOP fortunes in all plains states.**

• Comment on the Administration's proposal for Federal medical aid to the aged, to cost taxpayers $600 million a year: A University of Chicago team recently polled 2700 persons over 65; only two per cent claimed poverty prevented them from getting medical care.

• Last week, as friends of Truman claimed he wants to get his party's Presidential nomination, a note on the malodorous Truman Scandals appeared in the press. Truman's White House Secretary, Matthew J. Connelly, surrendered to a US Marshal to go to the penitentiary, convicted for attempting to block the income tax evasion trial of a St. Louis manufacturer.

• "Flemming's Folly" is what congressional conservatives call the Administration's medical care plan. Representative Burr Harrison (D.-Va.) denounced the brainchild of HEW Secretary Flemming as "more socialistic" than the Forand Bill. Representative Noah Mason (R.-Ill.) reacted, "I'm against it!" and Senator Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) attacked it. The proposal maps a $600 million-a-year raid on the US Treasury.

• A sign in front of Drew Pearson's Maryland farm advertises: "Drew Pearson's best manure."

• The House of Representatives last week urged the President to make the subject of the Captive Nations in Eastern Europe a topic at the forthcoming Summit. The vote was unanimous.

Kennedy: The snarling West Virginia contest Kennedy and Humphrey put on may echo with unhappy repercussions in the halls of the Los Angeles convention in July—so runs the thinking of many top Democrats.

Wise party veterans recall the savage 1924 convention in New York's old Madison Square Garden. One of the longest on record, it was marked by factional splits, name-calling, and religious antagonism. Compromise candidate John W. Davis was finally nominated when front-runner William G. McAdoo and Al Smith were deadlocked after 103 ballots, but bad feeling set the tone for the losing campaign that followed.

These Democrats see the seeds of such a split in Kennedy's charges that Humphrey is a "can't win" stalking horse for contenders afraid to meet him in primaries and Humphrey's assertions that millionaire Kennedy was running around the state with a "little black bag" and a checkbook. The "black bag" was a reminder that oil millionaire Edward L. Doheny in 1924 admitted giving Secretary of Interior Fall $100,000 in a black bag. Fall gave Doheny leases on Government oil lands. Fall went to prison.

Fear runs high that such below-belt sniping may set off a chain reaction of Democratic ill will which will erupt in the worst convention blowup since '24—Southern walkouts notwithstanding.

Kennedy also caused heated resentment within the party by waging a "war hero" offensive in West Virginia. His aides continually referred to Jack as a "fighting sailor," stressing his military record in contrast with Hubert (hernia) Humphrey's 4-F status. In the opinion of many, the Kennedy camp showed poor taste by referring to Jack's older brother, Joe, who died heroically as a bomber pilot, and the grief their mother suffered as a result.

Reportedly not only Hubert, but the other Democratic contenders as well, are miffed at Jack's wrapping himself in the hero's mantle and picturing himself as the only "red badge of courage" candidate (Johnson and Symington, who had good war records, scarcely like this campaign technique).

Kennedy has distributed 10,000 (his office's estimate) inch-long silver-plated campaign pins in the shape of a PT boat (the craft he commanded in 1943 when sunk by a Japanese destroyer) as well as silver PT-boat cuff links and tie clips. These trinkets, described as "medium-priced" jewelry, are given to Kennedy enthusiasts and many of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elevator boys in the Senate Office Buildings are wearing them.

Few can guess the tab for Jack's jewelry bill in West Virginia, but the office of anti-Kennedy Senator Robert C. Byrd (D.-W. Va.) estimates that the "little black bag" was opened to the tune of $200,000 during the crucial primary.

Dixie Struggle: States Righters showed great strength in an election in Alabama last week to name Presidential electors. Dixiecrat candidates would remain unpledged to the Democratic Presidential ticket put up at Los Angeles next July. "Loyalist" candidates would be pledged to support the ticket named at Los Angeles. At stake were eleven seats in the Electoral College. The States Righters led in a large field of candidates but, as many candidates did not win clear majorities, a run-off election is scheduled for May 31. Prospects are better for the States Righters than for the Loyalists.

The showing of the States Righters impressed politicos, for they bucked the powerful Democratic state organization; the Governor, the two US Senators and five out of nine Congressmen urged support for a loyalist slate. Former Governor Frank Dixon is one of the leaders of the States Righters and the Loyalists labelled him and his friends the "Dixon-Nixon" ticket. Coming weeks, preceding the run-off election, should witness an animated struggle between the two forces.

On the run-off outcome will depend whether the present regional trend towards withholding of Southern electoral votes will continue. As explained in "President from Dixie?" by John J. Synon (HUMAN EVENTS, April 28), States Righter slates of electors in many Southern states could throw the Presidential election into the House of Representatives and result in a Southerner winning the White House.

Rockefeller: Potomac pundits still speculate on the possibility of the GOP Presidential nomination going to Nelson Rockefeller. But many feel the spectre of defeat looms large for the New York Governor as a result of recent unspectacular but highly damaging reverses.

The primaries tell a sad tale for Rocky in figures his publicists cannot brush off. In the Pennsylvania and Massachusetts primaries—both held April 26—Rockefeller fell far short of a public mandate.

Although Rockefeller campaigned in the Keystone State (speaking for an old college roommate running for Congress), his total write-in vote was just over 10,000. Nixon polled upwards of a million votes to best Nelson by a 100-1 ratio. In Massachusetts Nixon totaled 55,000 votes to 5,000 Rocky write-ins.

In Ohio, former GOP Senator George Bender ran in the Buckeye primary for delegate "favorable to Rockefeller" and was beaten. Erstwhile Rockefeller supporter Senator Homer Capehart of Indiana, possibly foreseeing the big Nixon vote in last week's Hoosier primary, dropped Rocky and endorsed the Nixon candidacy.

Cuba: The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's three-day hearings last week on Communist infiltration of the Caribbean led off with testimony by a Catholic priest who backed up charges of foreign Communist influences in Cuba.

Father Eduardo Aguirre, pressured out of Cuba because of pro-American and anti-Communist sentiments, told the Senators that Russian, Czech, Yugoslav and especially Chinese Reds are now in Cuba guiding the "revolution."

Father Aguirre stated that Havana's far-left news agency, *Prensa Latina*, is a Communist organ. He named several Communists in the agency and stated that he had been told by a reliable non-Communist source on *Prensa Latina* that it carried on regular coded contact between Reds in Cuba and Prague, Czechoslovakia.

The priest also said Castro's agents in the United States are Communists and they operate on orders from the Cuban tourist bureau in Miami, Florida. Anti-Castro Cubans, Senator George Smathers (D.-Fla.) has repeatedly noted, are not allowed within 150 miles of Miami, by order of the State Department.

The Soft Life: Recent press reports set Adlai Stevenson's wealth at $500,000—small compared to the fortunes of Symington, Johnson and Kennedy. But don't be fooled by the holes in the portly egghead's shoes. A more careful investigation suggests he's worth more than that.

For instance, Adlai owns one-fourth of the Bloomington (Illinois) *Pantagraph*, a newspaper that publishers estimate as worth more than $5 million—with Adlai's share being $1¼ million. He possesses rich farmland near Bloomington, and also a home with an estimated value of $150,000. He holds a handsome portfolio of blue chip stocks. Illinois sources report that Stevenson need hardly touch these riches, as he receives a large "earned" income, mostly for the value of his name to his law firm.

The Prairie State observers note that Adlai does little actual work, preferring his role of intellectual lounge lizard in the drawing rooms of the leisure class "liberals."

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE INCREASE

HUMAN EVENTS subscription rates go up July 1. You may EXTEND your subscription at present LOW rates—if you act NOW. Fill out this coupon:

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S. E., Washington 3, D. C.
Please EXTEND my subscription for the period marked.

CHECK SERVICE DESIRED	Rate July 1	Renew NOW at	
☐ 1 year subscription	$12.50	$11.00	Saving you $ 1.50
☐ 2 year subscription	25.00	17.00	Saving you 8.00
☐ 3 year subscription	37.50	23.00	Saving you 14.50
☐ 4 year subscription	50.00	29.00	Saving you 21.00
☐ 5 year subscription	62.50	33.00	Saving you 29.50

☐ Remittance enclosed ☐ Bill me ☐ Bill my company

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kefauver in Trouble: Ten Tennessee newspapers have already endorsed Judge Andrew J. (Tip) Taylor in his battle to unseat Senator Estes "Coonskin" Kefauver—and the state's Democratic primary is still three months away.

The unusual number of endorsements so early in the campaign—including some by papers which opposed Taylor when he sought the governorship in 1958—is seen by Volunteer State observers as evidence that Kefauver is in deep trouble with the home folks. One try to boost Kefauver, by claiming the Teamsters Union was supporting his foe, backfired dismally when the local Teamster boss said he probably would back Kefauver. (Pro-Kefauverites outside Tennessee, however, are still playing up Estes as one opposed by Hoffa.)

Kefauver has also been censured by two county Democratic committees for siding with northern "liberal" Democrats in the civil rights debate. During Southern efforts to filibuster the rights bill, Kefauver punctually showed up at quorum call after quorum call in opposition to his southern colleagues. His continued presence stood in sharp contrast to his record in previous years; in his 12-year Senate career Kefauver has missed about one-third of all quorum calls and roll calls. Tennesseans are wondering why their senior Senator found it necessary to give his all to the civil rights drive when he has so frequently been missing from his Senate post on other occasions.

Reuther and Mazey: Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, talks tough to the Soviets these days and gets a bad press in Moscow.

But whatever Reuther says for public consumption, the facts are that some of the views of his right-hand man in the UAW, Emil Mazey, do not collide with Soviet foreign policy.

Mazey has been traveling here, there and everywhere since the first of the year, telling people the AFL-CIO should dump its hard anti-Communist policy. Mazey, instead, calls for recognition of Red China and abandonment of Quemoy and Matsu, and insists that the already-flexible US policy toward the USSR should "be more flexible." Quoted in the Communist *Worker*, Mazey also states, "We lost 33,000 American lives in Korea to perpetuate the Rhee police state," and adds that billions were "poured down the rathole of Chiang Kai-shek operations."

That Mazey's statements are welcomed by the Communists can be seen by the Worker's *publication of one of Mazey's speeches advocating recognition of Red China, and its heavy coverage (on May Day) of a speech he made before the left-wing Sane Nuclear Policy Committee.*

Housing Bill: The "Emergency" Housing bill, authorizing the Federal National Mortgage Association ("Fannie Mae") to borrow $1 billion from the Treasury to purchase mortgages, is now being tabbed as "the bill nobody wants but us Democrats." Passed last week by the House, it will be considered by a Senate subcommittee this week.

The Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, which governs Fannie Mae, has said "it would be economically injurious to the American people." Privately, officials of Fannie Mae, which already owns $6 billion of mortgages, say they are against the bill. Eisenhower, Republicans say, will veto it, and even the president of the Mortgage Bankers Association has indicated he is against it and says money is "definitely easing" and not "tight" as the Democrats contend.

The Democrats have said there is an "emergency" in housing because fewer units will be built this year than last. But last year, as nine Republicans on the House Banking and Currency Committee pointed out, was the second best in home-building history. The bill, they added, is obviously inflationary and amounts to a "billion dollar pipeline to the back door of your Treasury," as one Congressman put it. They also pointed out that a similar bill passed in 1958 did almost nothing to stimulate any building. And, as was further noted, the bill only helps the lender, not the home buyer, since the former can sell any mortgage he acquires to Fannie Mae at the full par value. It is, in the words of Congressman Edgar Hiestand (R.-Calif.), just "another Democratic boondoggle."

Education: The admissions director of New York University has poked a gaping hole in the arguments of many educationists that more and bigger colleges are needed to meet a rising demand.

Fred E. Crossland terms the "crisis" in college enrollments a "statistical illusion," pointing out that "today's candidates are bombarding the mails with applications to three, four, five or a dozen colleges." But they only enroll in one of those colleges, and in many cases never had any intention of entering some of the colleges to which they applied, but simply wanted to be sure of getting in somewhere. For example, Crossland noted that New York University had room for more students, despite a record number of applications last year.

Crossland concluded: "Certainly, until September, 1963, there will be adequate facilities for all young people who will benefit from a college education."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1960.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.

For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of **HUMAN EVENTS** and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors
JOHN R. BENEDICT NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Medical Care For The Aged

Why the Forand Bill Would Increase—Not Decrease—The Problem

By THOMAS B. CURTIS
Republican Congressman from Missouri

TODAY A PRESSURE GROUP, which is probably the most effectively organized for political action of any group in our society, has apparently decided to use the problem of medical and hospital care for some of the aged as an issue to test whether or not this kind of demagogery can still be used successfully in America.

This group of Americans is called Americans for Democratic Action—of which the most powerful segment is the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO dominated by Walter Reuther, a member of the ADA executive committee. COPE has decided to abandon the issue of the Landrum-Griffin bill for the 1960 campaign and see whether or not it can make the Forand Bill, which purports to meet an aspect of the problem of the medical and hospital care for the aged, do in its stead.

Many of my colleagues have been receiving printed three-penny postcards which have the picture of two fine looking older people, a man and a woman, on one side and a lead quotation in biblical script, "Cast me not off," on the other side. Beneath in a box is a quotation from Psalm 71: "Cast me not off in the time of old age, forsake me not when my strength faileth." Under this box is the language: "I urge you to support the Forand bill assuring real health protection to retired citizens."

I have been receiving the same card from four states of the Union—Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, and Michigan—as well as from my own district in the St. Louis County area. These cards essentially come through the COPE apparatus; in other words, the organized COPE leaders are leading and participating in the endeavor. These cards are being handed out to older people, of course, and some of the older people may have sent the cards in. The lobbying pressures, however, have not yet come from the older people themselves.

Now the issue that Americans should be concerned about is how do we meet the problem that our old people have in this field of hospital and medical care. It is a serious problem. It is one that has not been completely met in our society, but I would remind my colleagues and our citizens that no society in the history of the world has ever solved this problem and that our society in the year 1960 has probably come closer to solving it than any other society ever has.

The progress will be even greater in the future if we do not destroy, through unwise action, the programs that are already giving us this progress and that promise further progress in the immediate future.

The previous mishandling of Federal fiscal affairs by the very people who are now indulging in this blasphemous campaign—by quoting the Bible to imply that those who do not agree with this idea to solve the problems of the aged are thereby casting off the elder citizen—has probably done more damage to these older people than any other single thing. It is this ADA group that must assume responsibility for the inflation that cut in half the purchasing power of the dollar of these people, almost all of whom are on fixed incomes. Now this group, having created this damage, would make it worse by interjecting the problem of health for the aged into the political arena. Through a "know nothing" propaganda campaign they are promoting further fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Federal Government which would have further deleterious effects on the problems of our aged through inflation.

Now let us discuss the Forand Bill. Does it really assure real health progress to retired citizens as the three-penny post card, mass produced by the COPE, states? Or will it damage the progress we have made?

I think it will do damage, that it will throw us backward, and thwart the progress we have made. This is the issue. The issue should not be to get votes; it should be what program is best for our aged citizens and for our society as a whole.

H.R. 4700 would, if it became law, provide the eleven million persons eligible for Old Age and Survivors Insurance benefits and their four million dependents and survivors with up to 60 days of hospital care, a limited amount of nursing home care, and certain surgical benefits. Sufficient money to pay for this ostensibly would come from an increase in the social security payroll tax of one-quarter of one per cent on the employee, and an equivalent amount on the employer.

Published weekly at 408 First Street S. E., Washington 3 D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Four million people over 65 are either employed, or wives of employed persons, and presumably are able to meet the costs of health care as well as they ever were. This represents nearly 25 per cent of the total older age population, and includes many active workers employed in companies with group health insurance plans.

Those in favor of the Forand type of legislation, limited as it is to this one aspect of our aged citizens, reason from these following premises:

First. The aged are too poor to pay for their medical care, although their medical needs are greater than those of any other age groups.

Second. The aged cannot get private health insurance or, if they can, the insurance is inadequate.

Third. These problems can be solved simply by extending the social security system into the field of health care.

BEFORE EXAMINING these assumptions and seeking to determine their validity let us look briefly at some of the general aspects of the aged people. The Social Security Act has arbitrarily defined "old age" and despite the fact that old age is relative and based upon physiological changes, the Social Security Act bases it upon birthdays—65 for a man and 62 for a woman.

By this standard there are now some 15.5 million Americans over 65 who can be called aged. This group is living evidence that we have the finest system of scientific medicine in the world and that our standards of life are unparalleled in history.

Each year our older population will increase, and by 1970 this fortunate Nation can expect to have 20 million people over 65. But the growing number of these aged have to some extent caught us unprepared. For example, we are only beginning to understand the waste of human resources involved in the arbitrary retirement of these people because of their chronological age.

I might say one of the greatest needs in the area for reform in the social security law today is the clause that does not permit these people to engage in employment and receive their entire social security benefit entitlement if they earn more than $1,200 a year.

And so far as these people I have been mentioning are concerned—Mr. Reuther and the organization COPE—they are the ones who have consistently resisted any liberation of this work clause because, as they say, they want these people out of the labor market.

So millions of men and women, many as capable as they were at 40, are shelved long before they should be; long before they want to be.

Let us examine the premise upon which the supporters of H.R. 4700 base their arguments. Although the health needs of our older people may be greater than those in other age groups, are the aged too poor to pay for their own medical care? The answer is that some are, but the overwhelming majority are not. We are told that three-fifths of all people over 65 have less than $1,000 per capita annual income. Although in one sense this is an accurate statistic, it would be hard to find a more misleading statistic. It is equally accurate and just as misleading to state that in 1957, the most recent year to which that misleading figure applies, 66.7 per cent of all Americans had incomes of $1,000 or less per year. In 1957 almost half of these persons over 14 years of age also had incomes of $1,000 or less per year, and 47 per cent of those between the ages of 14 and 65 had incomes below $1,000 a year.

Let us illustrate this. Suppose we organize a social club with only two requirements for membership, one, that no wives had incomes of their own and, two, that all husbands earned at least $25,000 a year. If we use the same statistical techniques as those employed in compiling the income figures pertaining to our people aged 65 and over, we could come up with this statement: that half the members of this social club have incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

Obviously the money income figure cited by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for those aged 65 and over is of little help to us in considering the financial problems of the aged. Income drops after retirement, yes, but no age group is likely to have as favorable a liquid asset position as the aged, 74 per cent of whom now own liquid assets of one form or another. Furthermore, the needs of the aged person are usually less; the heavy expense of raising a family are behind; for the most part homes are paid for. In fact, according to the OASI, almost three of every four beneficiary couples own their own homes, most of them free of mortgage. And the median equity in non-farm homes for the homeowner is $8,360; and add to that the household effects and so forth.

Only four per cent of the aged live in the homes of relatives. A survey in 1957 by the National Opinion Research Center determined that only 9.6 per cent of those interviewed would be unable to pay a medical bill of $500.

So when we consider the financial resources of the aged we can do it sensibly only if we know how many have income from employment, social security, pensions, annuities, savings, investments, insurance, and other assets. We can only measure financial resources intelligently if we consider them in terms of family income and assets.

Further, the Nation's doctors have reportedly stated that no person regardless of illness needs to forego a physician's service because of inability to pay. Expert medical testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee established another

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point. The aged have more than just individual health needs. As Dr. Frederick C. Swartz told the Ways and Means Committee:

"Care for any segment of our population—the aged included—calls for a cooperative attack on the problem by nurses, doctors, hospitals, social workers, insurance companies, community leaders, and others. It requires flexibility of medical technique—an ingredient which would unquestionably vanish the moment Government establishes a health program from a blueprint calling for mass treatment . . . .

"In the case of the aged, their health problem primarily involves acute illness and the so-called degenerative diseases. In a very large percentage of cases, the main need is not for an expensive hospital stay or a surgical operation, but for medical care at home or in the doctor's office."

THE FORAND BILL wishes not only to assist the aged population who do not need the greatest amount of assistance but it wants to move the Federal Government into the very area of medical care where private insurance is now most effective, the area of hospitalization and surgery.

H.R. 4700 is, therefore, like a salvo of grapeshot fired at a smoke-shrouded target. It would apply only to aged persons under social security, but it would apply to them whether they needed help or not, whether they wanted help or not, whether they could use the sort of help the bill undertakes to provide.

Just as you would expect from a volley of grapeshot, most of the ammunition would be well off the aiming point—if, indeed, there is one.

Let us examine the second premise of the bill's supporters—that the aged cannot get private health insurance, or that if they can, their insurance is inadequate.

The record disproves this completely. The growth of private health insurance during the past 25 years—I would say the past ten in particular—has been phenomenal. Today, 127 million Americans are covered, and it is significant that the amount of health insurance owned by aged people is growing at a rate faster than that of the population as a whole.

Private health insurance is not available to the aged?

Here is the answer:

There are now 37 Blue Shield plans in 34 states which offer coverage for the over-65 age group. In all but three instances, there is a companion Blue Cross plan as well.

An additional 16 Blue Shield plans, in eleven other states, have over-65 programs in various stages of development.

And more than 125 private health insurance firms—some of which are licensed in all states—offer coverage to the aged.

Health insurance benefits for the aged are provided in a number of different ways. Older active workers are, without exception, continued in group insurance plans. Most new group plans provide for continuation of benefits to retiring workers. Other group plans allow the retiring worker to convert his protection to an individual policy. Several insurers are now issuing group plans to such associations of older people as Golden Age clubs.

Most insurers continue into the later years individual contracts issued at younger ages. And contracts especially designed for older people do not require evidence of good health as a condition of eligibility. In fact, after a short probationary period, benefits are paid for loss due to pre-existing conditions.

Finally, there are some insurers who offer health insurance contracts that become paid up at age 65.

The Health Insurance Association of America estimates that 65 per cent of the aged needing and wanting protection will be insured by the end of this year; and as I have said this percentage will increase to 80 per cent by the end of 1965; and 90 per cent by 1970.

Health insurance, like medical care, cannot be dispensed on a production line basis. Health insurance is written in many forms, by many types of insurers, and with a wide variety of benefits. It is this widespread choice, which allows the buyer to select the coverage best suited to his individual needs, that provides the workable alternative to the compulsory system called for by H.R. 4700 and other plans. On the one hand is coverage tailored to meet the individual's own particular requirements; on the other a rigid, single pattern of benefits which bills like the Forand Bill would impose on everyone—rich or poor.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR. The facts show that private health insurance is increasingly meeting the needs of the aged, as well as the needs of other segments in the population. To substitute a compulsory system of health insurance for a voluntary system of health insurance that has proved its ability and willingness to do the job is neither a responsible nor a sound decision, especially because in the very process of substitution, we would be contributing to the demise of private health insurance.

For it is certain that those compelled by law to carry—at their own expense—the cost of national compulsory health insurance will neither be able nor anxious to carry private health policies as well.

There is a third premise of those backing such proposals as Mr. Forand's—that the health problems of the aged can be solved simply by extending the social security system into the field of health care.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As I pointed out, these proposals fail completely to help matters for better than 4 million people—those on old-age assistance, and those ineligible for OASI benefits. Yet this is the category of the aged population most likely to include the hardship cases.

Let us examine a number of other objections to these ill-conceived bills.

Assume, if you will, that we allow the Federal Government to control disbursement of funds under such programs, as all of them specify; that we allow an agency of the Federal Government to determine the benefits to be provided; that this agency be given the right to set rates of compensation for hospitals, nursing homes, dentists, and physicians; that this agency be empowered to audit and control its expenditures to hospitals, nursing homes and patients; and that this agency set and enforce standards of hospital and medical care—as indeed, it would be compelled to do.

Could the Federal Government assume these responsibilities—fiscal and otherwise—without affecting the quality of medical care which it dispensed? The answer is clearly that it could not.

THE GOVERNMENT, in such a case, would undertake to provide a service purchased from outside sources. It is inevitable that Government would tend to control the purveyors of those services, for he who pays the fiddler calls the tune.

The author of these bills disclaims that intention of meddling with the free practice of medicine. Just the same, if a single Government agency were placed in the position of buying perhaps 10 to 20 per cent of all care in the Nation's general hospitals, it takes no expert to see that this agency would possess great power to influence the operation and management of hospitals.

And possessing such power, no legislative restrictions this Congress could impose could prevent such a Government agency from wielding its power.

In the final analysis, the result of this would be that Government employees would, willy nilly, be telling the doctors what drugs and treatment they could provide; telling the hospital administrators how to run their hospitals; telling the nursing homes what they could, and could not, do.

Whether this is the intent of H.R. 4700 or not, this certainly would be one of its effects, for as the Supreme Court of the United States has observed, "it is scarcely lack of due process for Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." Indeed the Federal Government may properly be called derelict if it does not ride herd over the money it spends.

There is the matter of unnecessarily overcrowding our hospitals, which are hard pressed as it is to cope with the demands for care of our rapidly growing population. Passage of the Forand Bill would mean that our hospitals would be swamped, and our doctors overwhelmed by the increased improper use that would inevitably result.

If this is not predictable, then we have learned nothing from the experience of Great Britain, of Canada, and of other nations which have experimented with national health insurance. It follows, as the night the day, that people will seek to collect a benefit for which they are paying—regardless of whether they need it or not.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION warns us that patients should be placed in hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions only when necessary, and that the length of their stay, as well as the treatment they are given, should be governed by their medical condition, and not by the arbitrary limitations of legislation or regulations.

It is a warning that must be heeded. The relationship that exists between a doctor and his patient is an individual and private one. To disrupt it with the intruding presence of Government, to seek to substitute a collective approach for an individual approach to patient care—these are foolhardy actions.

Actuarial estimates by the insurance industry are that costs under H.R. 4700 would range from about $2 billion to $2.4 billion for the first year of the program's operation. By 1980, according to this expert opinion, costs would range from nearly $6 billion to more than $7.5 billion. And that would require a level premium of from 2.32 per cent to 2.97 per cent of taxable payroll.

That is a far cry from the tax presently proposed.

Bills like H.R. 4700 have no built-in rollback feature. They start small, as a rock slide will; and they end up as avalanches. Once a measure like the Forand Bill becomes law, it is idle to wish it off the books; and once passed, no second-guessing will help.

Like Sinbad the Sailor's Old Man of the Sea, H.R. 4700 would cling to the shoulders of the American taxpayer generation after generation.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 19 — Section III HUMAN EVENTS May 12, 1960

Did The State Department Purge Rhee?

By JIM G. LUCAS

THE SUSPICION is growing that the United States had more to do with the overthrowing of the Syngman Rhee government than we will admit—or in all probability will ever be known.

And the reason Washington wanted him out of the way had nothing to do with the question of rigged elections which sent hundreds of thousands of teen-agers storming toward the presidential palace.

Obviously all the cards were stacked in favor of the "ins" in those March 15 elections. Equally obvious, there was some police intimidation and ballot stuffing. But no more than in South Viet Nam. And hardly as much as in the Philippines, where all politicians carry sidearms and many maintain small private armies. Certainly Mr. Rhee's opposition in South Korea was far better off than the "outs" in Turkey, where for years Premier Menderes has maintained a dictatorship by force.

Yet when the Korean disturbances began, almost as if by pre-arrangement the US let it be known where its sympathies lay—with the student demonstrators. Secretary of State Christian Herter called in Ambassador You Chan Yang and read him the riot act, then released the transcript to the press.

In Seoul, US Ambassador Walter McConaughy hurried to the presidential palace to say in effect the demonstrations were justified and to demand that Mr. Rhee correct the situation.

The smooth, organized efficiency with which the Embassy apparatus moved into the "Get Rhee" campaign was ample evidence they had advance assurance Washington would back them up.

Yet when Turkish students—taking the cue from the South Koreans—launched their own revolt, Washington maintained an embarrassed silence. Press officer Lincoln White muttered that the two situations were "not comparable."

Why not?

The answer seems to be that while Premier Menderes has jailed editors by the score—Mr. Rhee shut down one opposition paper and denied basic civil liberties—he has been nothing but tractable and manageable in his dealings with the United States.

Premier Menderes never has seriously opposed Uncle Sam in anything we really wanted. The same goes for heads of state in other areas where elections were rigged just as much as in South Korea.

Mr. Rhee, on the other hand, has given us trouble for the last 12 years. The stubborn, uncompromising old man refused to yield even when we flatly demanded it.

He refused to sign the armistice with the Communists, and when we prepared to negotiate an agreement he considered fatal, he turned loose 1000 war prisoners.

He's balked repeatedly at devaluating his currency and publicly criticized the "small" volume of American aid. He even forced us to recall one Ambassador he considered "impertinent."

Furthermore, Mr. Rhee has the embarrassing habit of being right more often than not. He scoffed at the possibility of any real truce with the Communists in 1953, at a time we blithely insisted Panmunjon was the Asian equivalent of Chamberlain's "peace in our time." As it turned out, the Panmunjon Pact is not worth the paper it's written on. Tactlessly, Mr. Rhee is not averse to reminding our red-faced diplomats of this fact.

The lesson seems to be that a head of state can do anything to his own people, so long as he goes along with Washington and throws no roadblocks in our way. Once he does that, he's suddenly guilty of rigging elections.

There's still no evidence that a majority of Korean voters—or ballot-casting adults—wanted to see Mr. Rhee go. Those who overthrew him were largely teen-agers. But with Washington firing salvo after salvo, that was enough. Turkey will prove whether students can do such things on their own.

If we did have a hand in stirring up the Korean revolt, nobody knows which of the many "spook" agencies we maintain there was responsible. It's even possible that one of these governments-within-the-government decided to get rid of Mr. Rhee without letting President Eisenhower in on the secret.

Mr. Lucas, the author of the above article, was in serious personal danger during the Seoul riots. He recently reported why and how in the *Scripps-Howard* newspapers:

"From the start I refused to concede the rioting students were a bunch of boy scouts on a hike. They'd burned public and private buildings and killed police. They were an organized mob and so I reported it.

"This didn't set well with those who were directing the Koreans' civil war. Threatening telephone calls began. At the Bando Hotel I received 18 in 24 hours. They said, 'Get out of Korea . . . You're not wanted here . . . You have 48 hours to get out—or else.' "

Then, reported Lucas, the US Ambassador received a telephone warning that "I'd be the first target" in a new demonstration. "A group of 50 students had been picked to go to my room on the 8th floor of the hotel and throw me out of the window."

Lucas was whisked out of Seoul by helicopter and then flown to Tokyo for safety.

This article is reprinted with permission of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance. Author Jim Lucas holds both Pulitzer and Ernie Pyle awards for journalism. He spent many months covering the battlefront during the Korean War.

Published weekly at 408 First Street S. E., Washington 3 D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Which China Has a Lobby Now?

By ROSALIE GORDON, from *America's Future*

THIS IS THE TALE of a book—a book published but still unpublished. Our meaning will be clear in a moment.

It is *The China Lobby in American Politics.* There is not now, and never has been, a China Lobby, unless it is made up of the pluggers for American recognition of Red China. The author is one of the latter. His name is Ross Y. Koen. He is 42 years old, and an assistant professor of political science at a California college.

Two years ago he obtained his Ph.D. degree at the University of Florida with a thesis which became this now-you-see-it, now-you-don't book. We have seen it, but you can't—at least not for awhile. And thereby hangs the tale. Not that we think you will be panting for a look at it, because, as is often the case with the thousands of Ph.D. theses produced each year, it is dull, dull, dull. We bring it up only because of the circumstances surrounding its almost-publication, and because if and when it is finally officially issued, it will no doubt be grabbed up by the "liberal"-oriented college libraries and recommended to unsuspecting students as "authoritative."

The publisher of the book is Macmillan & Co., an old and respected firm which has to its credit many fine volumes. The price on the copy we saw is $5.75—for 251 pages of text, but then "liberal"-oriented college libraries are well endowed. It is an attempt to show the nefarious machinations of all those who warned against the Red takeover of China, who spoke out in favor of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government and against Mao Tse-tung's Communist regime, who exposed the pro-Communist activities of the Institution of Pacific Relations and the Leftist infiltration of the American State Department. These, in the author's mind, make up the "China Lobby" of his title—a name first used by the N. Y. State Communist party. This fact the author acknowledges, with a straight face, early in his book.

It comprised such terrible characters (in Mr. Koen's mind) as Generals Wedemeyer, MacArthur, Chennault, the late Senators McCarran and McCarthy, Alfred Kohlberg, John T. Flynn, Freda Utley—but why go on? Let's just say it included everyone who was anti-Communist on the China issue. This mythical "lobby" was so successful that China fell into the hands of the Reds despite all its efforts. But the author (whose heroes are Owen Lattimore *et al.*) hates to give up his bogeyman. It is this "China Lobby" which prevents us from having a love affair with Red China.

Aside from the carmine-hued slant of this weird thesis and the inherent dullness of the writing, the book reveals an ignorance of China which is appalling in one who is teaching political science in a college. Also, it would take a book of nearly equal length to point out its inaccuracies.

But the most interesting thing about this highly uninteresting book is its journey into the bookstalls and out again. It was scheduled for publication last month. Copies had been shipped to stores and were on their shelves. Then a week before the official publication date, the publishers called back all copies—but a few had escaped. A call to a Macmillan senior editor brought this reply:

"Yes, the book has been withdrawn. We had to make a very minor change—nothing serious—the basic facts are correct as I know from my own knowledge, but it was a rather controversial thing and the author did not have sufficient substantiation."

A MINOR CHANGE? Nothing serious? Mr. Koen declared in his book that a number of Chinese officials smuggled narcotics into the US with the full knowledge and connivance of the Nationalist Government and (as though this smear were not bad enough) that "several prominent Americans have participated in and profited from these transactions." This came to the attention of the Chinese Ambassador. It also brought threats of libel action from William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester *Union Leader* and one of the patriotic Americans included in the "lobby."

Macmillan withdrew the book for "minor changes." Perhaps final judgment on this book has been supplied by the Hon. H. J. Anslinger, US Commissioner of Narcotics. He wrote the Chinese Ambassador: "I can give you an unqualified statement that this is manufactured out of the whole cloth; that there is no scintilla of evidence that any Chinese officials have been engaged in illegal smuggling of narcotics into the United States with the full knowledge and connivance of the Chinese Nationalist Government. This statement is so fantastic that if it is any measuring rod as to the rest of the book I assume it can be similarly classified."

But it seems to us there is still an explanation due from the Macmillan Company. Is this what one of their editors considers a "minor change," the "basic facts" of which are "correct as I know from my own knowledge?" And who and what induced Macmillan to publish the book in the first place? Why not leave jobs like this to those firms who will publish any piece of trash which comes along, so long as it is slanted well to the Left?

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "DID THE STATE DEPARTMENT PURGE RHEE?" and "WHICH CHINA HAS A LOBBY NOW?" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 19 — Section IV HUMAN EVENTS May 12, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
FALLS, WISCONSIN

Germany: A Solution

How To Put The Soviets On The Run

By WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

THE COMMUNIST REGIME in East Germany is a Quisling government, and there is no one on either side of the Iron Curtain who has any doubts about it. The people's uprising of 1953 has clarified once and for all that the "mass basis" of the East German Communists consists of, at the most, 10 per cent of the population, plus the Soviet troops stationed in East Germany.

The government of West Germany, on the other hand, derives its legitimate authority from the indisputable fact that it is the government of Germany —the *only* government of the *only* Germany there is. Of all the cunning propaganda tricks of the Soviets, none was more skillful than the phrase of "the two Germanys." It has seduced the "realistic" opportunists in the whole world, and above all in West Germany, to camouflage the proposed capitulation as a "recognition of given facts." And now the Soviets deem the confusion of the West sufficiently advanced to enforce, with a "solution of the Berlin crisis," *their* solution of the entire German problem.

What, in truth, are the given facts? The central fact is that East Germany has never seceded from Germany. It simply was occupied, in 1945, by troops of the victorious Allies—just as every other part of Germany. The sections that are today known as "West Germany" were occupied by the United States, England and France—East Germany by the Soviets. All four powers acted under joint responsibility (and, at least officially, under a joint command). In all contexts of the international law the Bonn government, once it began to exist and to perform, was recognized by all four powers as the legitimate successor to that German government against which the four powers were making war till June 1945. Three of the occupying powers (the United States, England, and France) ended the military occupation in the early Fifties. The fourth —Soviet Russia—remained entrenched in its territory of occupation. And the "East German problem" consists in illegal, arbitrary, and provocative extension of a war measure into an era of international peace. That a few thousand East Germans shine Soviet shoes for a consideration and serve them in various other respects has nothing to do with the *essential* facts of the situation.

Of those essential facts none was so absurd and unforgivable as the willingness of the three Allied governments to accept Berlin, a city deeply *inside* the zone assigned to the Soviets for occupation, as "a joint occupation responsibility" of all four powers—without insisting that the supply lines of the western powers remain in the territory assigned to the western powers of occupation. An officer candidate who would consider such an arrangement acceptable would of course flunk the exams at any officers' school in the world. However, for reasons of his own, the Allied commander in chief, General Eisenhower, deemed these conditions acceptable; and West Berlin has thus remained, since 1945, the famous "western island" inside the Soviet zone of occupation. [But] if the mutinous Soviet troops create in Berlin difficulties for the western Allies, then it remains the duty of the United States, Britain and France to enforce the authority of their governments.

Soviet Price for Reunification

[I have met no one] in Germany who would not admit that Germany, unless the West *forced* the Soviets *militarily* to withdraw from East Germany (a highly unlikely case), would have to pay the Soviets a stiff price for "reunification." But even the "optimists" admit that the Soviet *minimum* demand for withdrawing from East Germany would be the "demilitarization" of *all* Germany, its withdrawal from NATO, and the recognition of Ulbricht's "Socialist Unity party" (that is, of the Communist party of Germany) on the level of government.

THE TRULY DECISIVE result of a "demilitarization" of Germany would be the immediate demise of NATO; or to put the same thing in other and clearer words, the military retreat of the United States from the Continent. I do not know of a single military expert in Germany or in France, or in Italy, who doubts that to Germany falls the central role in *any* system of European defense and particularly in the given (and evidently unchangeable) NATO structure. [No] European nation can be expected to retain a permanent state of preparedness against the Soviets, once Germany has escaped into a state of "neutrality." And it is altogether inconceivable that, in such a case, the United States would continue to hang on to its precarious position on the outer fringes of Europe.

Therefore, to recognize the "German Democratic Republic" in any fashion at all would not just be a moral but an eminently practical capitulation. An illegally occupied part of Germany would, with one stroke of surrender, be turned into a Communist fortification *inside* Germany. Obviously the Soviet troops would not be withdrawn from East Germany until at least the "demilitarization" of *all* Germany were granted. And this "demilitarization," under the geographical and psychological conditions of the case, would mean of necessity that a disarmed

---

Adapted from *Germany and the East-West Crisis*, by William S. Schlamm. Copyright © 1959 by William S. Schlamm. Courtesy of David McKay Company, Inc.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany must accept its dependence on its militarily overwhelming neighbor, the Soviet Union: there would be no other military power, or potent military alliance, left in Europe.

This is why any recognition of the Ulbricht regime inherently implies the surrender of all Germany to the East.

Only he who cannot read, or refuses to understand what he is reading, can overlook these consequences resulting from a "negotiated reunification" of Germany. They are neither speculations nor interpretations. They are merely a condensation of whole libraries of western and Soviet writings on strategy. And the "realists" who, in the face of predictable, predicted, and inescapable consequences of "a readiness to negotiate," rush into the suicide of such "negotiations," have not even the puny moral alibi of Neville Chamberlain and Edouard Daladier. For in 1938 one did not yet know what dynamic explosiveness animated nazism. But twenty years later the dynamic explosiveness of communism had already subdued a billion men.

The favorite political pun of the "realists" remains to point out the relative irrelevancy of any German armament: Is it not, assuming a rocket and missile war, utterly unimportant whether United States rockets (which must attain a range of several thousand miles) are fired a hundred miles nearer to, or farther from, the Soviet borders?

Germany's "demilitarization" has indeed no bearings on the *outcome* of a future rocket war. But if the heart land of the Continent were ever so militarily denuded that it could never again repel even a "conventional" Soviet thrust, then it either cannot be defended at all or only with the ultimate weapons and the ultimate war. Thus the advocates of *any* kind of "neutralization" of Germany propose, in truth, that Germany's alternatives be reduced to this one decision—either to capitulate before any kind of Soviet thrust, or to provoke a global war that may destroy the human race.

Why Not A Peace Treaty For Germany?

Now there is, indeed, the Potsdam Agreement of 1945 that stipulates that "the Allied Nations" will [only as a unit] negotiate and sign a peace treaty with defeated Germany. [But] after ten years of cold war, not a shred of the Potsdam Agreement remains legally valid. Since 1948 we have done everything else the Potsdam Agreement has ruled out; and we have done it for the forceful reason that the Soviets had violated every single one of its major stipulations, and crucially, long before we did.

[An] American peace treaty with Germany will have to establish the fact that German sovereignty covers all territory that was internationally recognized as Germany by all powers of the world, including the Soviet Union, the day before Adolph Hitler took power. But with the sole exception of the German-Polish border (which was an unreasonable and irritating freak of willfulness long before Hitler) the peace treaty ought to clarify beyond any misinterpretation that Germany is the sovereign master of its *entire* territory. It must articulate the basic claim of Germany, the United States, and the entire West against the Soviet Union: that Soviet troops must cease the illegal occupation of the eastern parts of sovereign Germany.

What is needed here is the signature, not of the United States Government, but of America. For that peace treaty—and this is its significance—will have to initiate a new American policy in regard to the Soviet Empire. It would be signed in open renunciation of all the appeasement advocates who cling to the fallacious axiom that America's relations with the Soviet Union are still regulated by the Potsdam Agreement of 1945. It would at last restore not only German but American sovereignty. It would mark a complete change of the American posture in the cold war—from defensive to the offensive. In other words I suggest a policy that is diametrically opposed to the conduct advocated by Walter Lippmann and George F. Kennan.

At the bottom of all Kennan-Lippmann plans is the mendacious syllogism that the Soviets, if only they had nothing to fear for themselves, would leave us alone. But the Communists mean to possess the world; and they mean it in dead earnest.

In history, which does not read Mr. Lippmann's column, and thus proceeds with its own prejudice, there is always one side that attacks and advances, while the other retreats and yields. I propose that our side at last begin to move. The Soviets, for a change, will wonder and fret. Germany and the United States will coordinate pressures; blanket the usurped parts of Germany with western literature, western broadcasts, and western modes of living. Once and for all the United States-German alliance would end Europe's "neutralist" machinations that freeze the anti-Soviet rally today, and will make it impossible tomorrow.

[For] "neutralism," a moral malady, unfailingly responds to determined power. When it erupted in megalomania, and obscenely dishonored its name, Germany opened the West to the Communist invaders. If America comprehends the chance, a new Germany that has restored its spirit and recovered its national integrity may yet save the West.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "GERMANY: A SOLUTION" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED